

Appl No. 10/760,240
Amdt. Dated August 7, 2006
Response to Office Action of June 14, 2006

11

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of June 14, 2006 the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment of the claims and the following Remarks.

Regarding Amendment

In the Amendment:

Page 36 of the specification has been amended to correct a error of a typographical nature.

independent claim 1 is amended to omit the subject matter regarding the customer selected width and slitting of the web to that width, and to recite that the franchisee is provided with the pattern collection in a physical medium having identifying symbols and with a scanner for scanning those symbols in order to communicate the customer selected patterns to the printer from the claimed digital storage medium. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 39, lines 12-22 of the present specification;

dependent claim 6 is cancelled accordingly;

dependent claim 10 is amended to conform with amended claim 1; and

dependent claims 3-5, 7-9, and 11-51 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the Amendments to not add any new matter to the present application.

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

Regarding Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22-33, 39, 40-43, 46, 47, 49 and 50

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of above-described amended independent claim 1, and claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22-33, 39, 40-43, 46, 47, 49 and 50 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by Martin (US 2002/0171692) in view of Fujii et al. (US 6,715,423) and Kwasny et al. (US 2002/0118990), for at least the following reasons.

In the present invention, as clearly recited in amended independent claim 1, the collections of wallpaper patterns 200 are provided in books or swatches to the franchisee, so that a customer may peruse the collections and select a described wallpaper therefrom. On order to easily input the selected patterns into the wallpaper printer, the franchisee is provided with a scanner 108 for scanning an associated barcode or other symbol provided on the swatches/books for each pattern. The selected pattern is then retrieved electronically by the printer for printing (see page 39, lines 12-22 of the present specification).

On the other hand, Martin discloses allowing an operator to have personal images incorporated into a printed wallpaper product 10 by arranging a printer 18 to accept personal digital images 30 from a source such as a memory card, CD or personal computer (see paragraphs [0003], [0008] and [0009] of Martin), Fujii discloses providing an image input device 33,42 to a contractor or consumer being a conventional scanner or digital camera for scanning in illustrations or photographs of original images of personally designed wallpaper into the wallpaper manufacturing apparatus (see col. 7, lines 8-53 of Fujii), and Kwasny merely

Appln No. 10/760,240
Amdt. Dated August 7, 2006
Response to Office Action of June 14, 2006

12

discloses a slicer and cutter mechanisms 14 and 16 for outputting various sized printed digital photos from a printer 10 (see paragraphs [0019]-[0024] of Kwasny).

Thus, none of Martin, Fujii and Kwasny disclose or suggest providing a physical and electronic collection of patterns to a franchisee, nor providing the franchisee with a scanner for scanning in symbols on the physical pattern collections to retrieve a customer's selected pattern from the electronic pattern collection, as is required by amended claim 1. This is because, Martin is directed to allowing a customer to incorporate personal images into a wallpaper product, Fujii merely allows images for incorporation into a wallpaper product to be captured using scanning or photographic equipment, and Kwasny is completely silent as to wallpaper products.

Thus, the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 3-5 and 7-51 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny either taken alone or in combination with one another.

Regarding Claim 5

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claim 5 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Goldstein (US 2002/069078), because Goldstein specifically teaches a computerised interface for the selection of custom wallpaper designs (see abstract and paragraphs [0003]-[0007] of Goldstein) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

Regarding Claims 6 and 9

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claim 9 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Gerber et al. (WO 03/064170), because Gerber merely discloses an arrangement similar to Fujii in which a conventional scanner 24 is provided so that print designs can be scanned into a computer 18 to allow design input (see page 3, lines 18-20 and 31-33 of Gerber) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

Regarding Claims 7, 8 and 15

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claims 7, 8 and 15 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Krinsky (US 6,354,212), because Krinsky merely discloses an arrangement similar to Martin and Fujii in which customised designs for wallpaper products are digitized and presented to a customer either electronically or physically for selection (see col. 4, lines 5-27 of Krinsky) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

Regarding Claim 10

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claim 10 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii, Kwasny and Krinsky further in view of Lapointe et al. (US 5,056,142), because Lapointe merely discloses providing an array of symbols 3 on a wallpaper design in an encrypted pattern and providing an overlay card 7 which can be used in conjunction with registration marks 5 associated with the symbol array to decrypt the array (see col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line of Lapointe) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii, Kwasny and Krinsky.

Appin No. 10/760,240
Amdt. Dated August 7, 2006
Response to Office Action of June 14, 2006

13

Regarding Claim 13

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claim 13 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Schoendienst et al. (US 5,302,037), because Schoendienst merely discloses a web feeding and handling system for a printer (see abstract of Schoendienst) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

Regarding Claim 16

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claim 16 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Bilek (US 4,322,044), because Bilek merely discloses a web alignment and loading apparatus for a printer (see abstract of Bilek) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

Regarding Claims 19, 38 and 44

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claims 19, 38 and 44 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Sandhoo (DE 29908649), because Sandhoo merely discloses a dryer for a printed web (see page 5, lines 11-16 of Sandhoo) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

Regarding Claims 21, 35, 45 and 48

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claims 21, 35, 45 and 48 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Harris et al. (US 5,161,685), because Harris merely discloses a light-tight storage enclosure for a photosensitive web for input to a printer (see abstract of Harris) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

It is noted that in the rejection text related to Harris et al., the Examiner refers to "Taylor et al.". The Applicant has assumed that "Harris et al." was the intended citation.

Regarding Claim 34

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claim 34 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Nagel (US 5,362,008), because Nagel merely discloses a cassette for storing photosensitive material for input to a printer (see abstract of Nagel) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

Regarding Claims 36 and 37

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claims 36 and 37 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Nielson et al. (US 4,885,964), because Nielson merely discloses a tape slitter for slitting a webbed material (see abstract of Nagel) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii and Kwasny.

Regarding Claim 50

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claim 50 is not taught or suggested by Martin, Fujii and Kwasny further in view of Schoendienst and Yada (JP 2003-063700), because Yada merely discloses a paper roll supply device for printer (see abstract of

Appln No. 10/760,240
Amdt. Dated August 7, 2006
Response to Office Action of June 14, 2006

14

Yada) and therefore does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Martin, Fujii, Kwasny and Schoendienst.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



KIA SILVERBROOK



TOBIN ALLEN KING



JANETTE FAYE LEE

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762